

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATE COMMISSION



0000100043

RECEIVED

2009 JUN 26 P 3:01

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

JUN 29 2009

DOCKETED BY

MM

COMMISSIONERS

KRISTIN K. MAYES, Charmin

GARY PIRECE

PAUL NEWMAN

SANDRA D. KENNEDY

BOB STUMP

In the Matter of:

SECURE RESOLUTIONS, INC, an Oregon
Corporation;

DOUGALS COTTLE and KYLA COTTLE,

husband and wife,

Respondents.

) Docket No.: S-20677A-09-0256

)
) NOTICE OF OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING
) REGARDING PROPOSED ORDER TO CEASE AND
) DESIST, ORDER FOR RESTITUTION, FOR
) ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTIES, AND FOR
) OTHER AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

I.

Jurisdiction

1. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

II.

Respondents

2. Respondent denies allegation, and by further response, Secure
Resolutions is an Oregon Corporation with license to do business in
Arizona. Respondents deny further allegations.

1 3. Respondent denies allegation, as further response Paul Cottle, not
2 Douglas Cottle, was the registered President of Secure Resolutions
3 from 2003 through 2006 with the authority and responsibility to
4 manage the affairs of the business provided by Secure Resolutions
5 legal documentation. Paul Cottle is a resident of Arizona.

6 4. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
7 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

8 5. Respondent denies allegation.

9 6. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
10 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

11
12 III.

13 Facts

14 7. Respondent denies allegation.

15 8. Respondent neither admits nor denies the allegations.

16 9. Respondent denies allegation.

17 10. Respondent denies allegation.

18 a. Respondent denies allegation.

19 b. Respondent denies allegation.

20 c. Respondent denies allegation.

21 11. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
22 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

23 12. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
24 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

25 13. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
26 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment and by

1 further response, W. KIKUCHI represented himself to the company as a
2 licensed broker and as a person that made his living by raising
3 investment funds for several companies.

4 14. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
5 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

6 15. Admit that any investment monies that were received were made
7 payable to SRI, never made payable to Cottle or Cottles. As further
8 response, Respondent denies all further allegations, not of
9 sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth
10 of the averment.

11 16. Respondent denies allegation, further response we agree that DAO
12 was an officer of SRI.

13 17. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
14 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

15 18. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
16 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

17 19. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
18 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

19 20. Respondent denies allegation

20 21. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
21 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

22 22. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
23 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

24 a. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
25 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.
26

1 b. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
2 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

3 c. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
4 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

5 d. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
6 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

7 e. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
8 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

9 f. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
10 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

11 23. Respondent denies allegation.

12 24. Respondent denies allegation.

13 25. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
14 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

15 26. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
16 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

17 27. Respondent denies allegation.

18 28. Respondent denies allegation.

19 29. Respondent denies allegation.

20 a. Respondent denies allegation.

21 b. Respondent denies allegation.

22 30. Admit, as further response, some shareholders and the Arizona
23 Corporate Commission have interfered with a fair market sale that
24 would have compensated the shareholders of Secure Resolutions for
25 millions of dollars.
26

- 1 31. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
2 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.
- 3 32. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
4 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.
- 5 33. Respondent denies allegation.
- 6 34. Respondent denies allegation.
- 7 35. Respondent denies allegation.
- 8 36. Respondent denies allegation.
- 9 37. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
10 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.
- 11 38. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
12 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.
- 13 39. Respondent denies allegation.
- 14 40. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
15 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.
- 16 a. Admit, as further response, this contract was with Olympus
17 through their subordinate ITX in the Japanese Market.
- 18 b. Admit, Secure Resolutions was working a venture with Ahnlab.
- 19 c. Admit Secure Resolutions had a business relationship with
20 Fujitsu and deny further allegations.
- 21 41. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
22 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.
- 23 42. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
24 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.
- 25 43. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
26 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

1 44. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
2 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

3 45. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
4 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

5 46. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
6 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

7 47. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
8 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

9 48. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
10 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

11 49. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
12 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

13 a. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
14 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

15 b. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
16 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

17 c. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
18 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

19 d. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
20 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

21 e. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
22 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

23 f. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
24 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

25 g. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
26 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

1 h. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
2 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

3 i. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
4 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

5 j. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
6 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

7 50. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
8 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

9 51. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
10 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

11 52. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
12 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment, as
13 further response, Secure Resolutions communicated with HLHZ verbally
14 as well as in writing on multiple occasions.

15 53. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
16 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

17 54. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
18 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

19 55. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
20 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

21 56. Respondent denies allegation.

22 57. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
23 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

24 58. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
25 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.
26

- 1 59. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
2 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.
- 3 60. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
4 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.
- 5 61. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
6 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.
- 7 62. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
8 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.
- 9 63. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
10 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.
- 11 64. Respondent denies allegation.
- 12 65. Respondent denies allegation.
- 13 66. Respondent denies allegation, as further response Paul Cottle not
14 Douglas Cottle was the presenter at this meeting and Franciee
15 Mattice, a CFO and board member.
- 16 67. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
17 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.
- 18 68. Respondent denies allegation.
- 19 69. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
20 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.
- 21 70. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
22 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment, as
23 further comment HLHZ and Secure Resolutions had several verbal
24 communications about company projections and stock value.
- 25 71. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
26 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

1 72. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
2 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

3 73. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
4 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

5 74. Respondent denies allegation.

6 75. Respondent denies allegation.

7 76. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
8 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

9 77. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
10 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

11 78. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
12 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

13 79. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
14 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

15 80. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
16 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment, as
17 further response the company was growing and in-fact received
18 several awards including being named in the top 163 emerging tech
19 Dynamos in the nation.

20 81. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
21 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

22 82. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
23 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

24 83. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
25 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

1 84. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
2 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

3 85. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
4 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

5 86. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
6 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

7 a. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
8 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

9 b. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
10 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

11 c. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
12 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

13 d. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
14 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

15 e. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
16 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

17 f. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
18 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

19 87. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
20 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

21 88. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
22 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

23 89. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
24 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

25 90. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
26 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

1 91. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
2 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

3 a. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
4 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

5 b. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
6 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

7 c. Respondent denies allegation.

8 d. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
9 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment,
10 as further response, Secure Resolutions had an agreement with
11 ITX a division of Olympus Corporation.

12 e. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
13 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment,
14 as further response Secure Resolutions was working on an
15 agreement with Ahnlab.

16 f. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
17 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment,
18 as further response Secure Resolutions had a business
19 relationship with Fujitsu.

20 g. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
21 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

22 h. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
23 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment,
24 as further response this was disclosed in shareholder
25 meetings.

1 i. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
2 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

3 j. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
4 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

5 k. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
6 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

7 l. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
8 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

9 92. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
10 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

11 93. Respondent denies allegation, not of sufficient knowledge or
12 information to form a belief as to the truth of the averment.

13 VII.

14 REQUESTED RELIEF

15 Respondents request that the Commission deny the relief requested by
16 the commission and grant the Respondents request that the Commission
17 order the following:

18 1. Order the Commission, it's representatives, employees, and agents
19 from alleging and publicly posting that Douglas Cottle and Kyla
20 Cottle are persons controlling Secure Resolutions.

21 2. Require the Commission to confine any allegations to actions
22 solely within the state of Arizona.

23 3. Order Arizona Corporate Commission and it's representatives,
24 employees, officers and agents to immediately stop and refrain
25 from further committing and aiding in public acts of defamation
26 of character upon Secure Resolutions, Douglas Cottle and Kyla

1 Cottle, and pay restitution for such acts and immediately remove
2 such written posting. see EXHIBIT A.

3 4. Order Arizona Corporation Commission to provide restitution and
4 penalties to Secure Resolutions, Douglas Cottle and Kyla Cottle
5 for violation of A.C.C 44-2042 Confidentiality in an
6 investigation by publically soliciting information against the
7 Respondents through the Internet during a confidential
8 investigation. See EXHIBIT A.

9 5. Order Arizona Corporate to pay restitution in the amount of at
10 least \$5,000,000 US dollars for wrongfully interfering with a
11 fair market sale of Secure Resolutions that would have
12 compensated the shareholders and in which the Arizona Corporation
13 Commission was notified of such sale.

14 6. Order any other relief that the Commission deems appropriate.
15

16
17 Dated this 24 day of June, 2009
D. Cottle R. Cottle

18 Douglas Cottle
19 2792 E Santa Rosa Drive
20 Gilbert, AZ 85234
21
22
23
24
25
26

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

EXHIBIT A

• Report: #374561

• **Ripoff Report: Secure Resolutions Inc.**

<http://www.ripoffreport.com/reports/0/374/RipOff0374561.htm>

Category: Software

Secure Resolutions Inc. CEO Douglas Ronald Cottle Fraudulent Fund Raising / Investment Practices. Misleading Sales Data and Debt Default Status to Investors and Channel Sales Prospects. Illegal Revocation of Investor Shareholdings. See current AZ, CA, NV, HI, OR, WA, and Federal Investigations including Arizona Corporation Commission and Shareholder Actions Mesa Arizona

***Consumer Suggestion ..Important Update!**

Secure Resolutions Inc.

Phone: 800-295-8870

Fax: 480-491-7362

1921 South Alma School Road, Suite 201, Mesa, AZ 85210
Mesa, Arizona, 85210
U.S.A.

Submitted: 9/19/2008 11:41:04 PM

Modified: 6/17/2009 10:14:49 PM



Pmwarrior
Reno, Nevada

Ripoff Report Verified Safe

EXTREME WARNING about doing business with this company - Sales. Partnership or Investment. Complete thorough due diligence and contact investors, employees, prior employees, and vendors, and the Arizona and Oregon Corporation Commission before making any written or oral agreements with the dictatorship of this organization.

Several initial and subsequent investors are pursuing suite for fraudulent fund raising and misrepresentation and nondisclosure of debts as well as wrongful investment and SEC practices. See Arizona Corporation Commission investigation. See also numerous claims awarded to prior employees and vendors. See also public records of CEO's prior history with SRI, FutureCom Global, McAffe, LDS Church, and family records regarding civil claims.

If you believe you have experienced fraudulent and/or misleading representation from this company whether sales related , investment related, employee related, vendor related, please immediately contact any of the following:

Phong (Paul) Huynh phuyn@azcc.gov 602-542-0908 Atty Securities Division

Guy Phillips gphillips@azcc.gov 602-542-0182 Special Investigator

If you have received any documents, records, or emails, between 2001 to current, please foward to the above.

Bill
Reno, Nevada
U.S.A.

Bradley D. Gardner
Mesa, Arizona
U.S.A.

Response of Secure Resolutions, Inc. and Douglas Cottle to Bill from Reno, Nevada

Secure Resolutions, Inc. has no idea as to the identity of 'Bill' from Reno, Nevada. Neither does his e-mail address look familiar to company representatives. He is not a former director, officer or employee nor does he appear to be a former or current shareholder or investor. Representatives of Secure Resolutions, Inc. can only presume that this individual is using a fictional name because he knows he is spreading falsehoods about the company and Mr. Cottle.

To set the record straight, there have been no lawsuits filed against Secure Resolutions, Inc., by an investor or shareholder requesting monetary damages. Neither have there been 'numerous claims awarded to prior employees and vendors.' As a matter of fact, there have been no awards of any type to prior employees since Mr. Cottle became the CEO. As for the comment that individuals should examine various public records of the CEO's prior history with various organizations, including the LDS church, such references appear to be no more than a desperate attempt of a rather pathetic individual who will say or do anything to draw attention to himself. Indeed, 'Bill' does not even reference what prior history should be examined or what might be revealed.

Finally, 'Bill' makes reference to an investigation being conducted by the Arizona Corporation Commission. Since such investigations are considered confidential under Arizona law, Secured Resolutions, Inc., is not in a position to confirm or deny that such an investigation exists. Having said that, Secured Resolutions, Inc. and Douglas Cottle unequivocally state that no court or governmental agency has made any finding that either has engaged in any misconduct or any act or fraud.

Bradley D. Gardner
Legal counsel for Secure Resolutions and
Douglas Cottle
c/o Udall, Shumway & Lyons
30 West First Street
Mesa, Arizona 85210
480-461-5323
bdg@udallshumway.com